

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Office Action of March 18, 2008. This Amendment is in full response thereto. Thus, Applicants respectfully request continued examination and allowance of the application.

Objections to the Drawings:

The Examiner objected to Figure 2 as using reference character 5 for two different parts. Applicants have amended the Drawings to renumber one of the reference character 5's as 52 as suggested by the Examiner. A Replacement Sheet is being contemporaneously submitted with this Amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 18, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 18 has been amended to depend from claim 16 which recites a sliding seal, thereby providing antecedent basis. Claim 20 has been amended to depend from claim 19 thereby rendering it dependent from a non-canceled claim. Claim 22 has been amended to delete reference to any canceled claims. Therefore, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Challenger, et al. (5,492,147). Claim 15 has been canceled thereby mooted the rejection of that claim. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the other claims on the basis that Challenger, et al. fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a female part comprising a tubular guide with which a male part cooperates by sliding in a leaktight manner with respect to a cryogenic fluid. Challenger, et al. does not disclose use of the dry break coupling with a cryogenic

fluid. Additionally, one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that the rubber septum of Challenger, et al. would not provide a leaktight seal with respect to a cryogenic fluid. Such a one would further recognize that the very low temperature (at ambient pressure) of the cryogenic fluid would embrittle the rubber septum thereby rendering the Challenger et al. coupling inoperable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 16, 18, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger, et al. '147 in view of Jones (3,938,564).

With respect to claims 16, 18, and 25, Applicants respectfully traverse because modification of the Challenger et al. dry coupling with the liquid cryogen of Jones would render the Challenger et al. dry coupling unsuitable for its intended purpose. This is because one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that the rubber septum of Challenger, et al. would not provide a leaktight seal with respect to a cryogenic fluid. Such a one would further recognize that the very low temperature (at ambient pressure) of the cryogenic fluid would embrittle the rubber septum thereby rendering the Challenger et al. coupling inoperable. With respect to claim 26, Applicants respectfully traverse because modification of the Challenger et al. dry coupling with the liquid cryogen of Jones would render the Challenger et al. dry coupling unsuitable for its intended purpose. This is because one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize that the very low temperature (at ambient pressure) of the cryogenic fluid would embrittle the rubber septum thereby rendering the Challenger et al. coupling inoperable. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claim 27:

Applicant submits that new claim 27 is patentable over the art of record because it fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a first pivoting flap (19), an end (5) of a

